STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

WAKE COUNTY

BEFORE THE
PISCIPLINARY HEARING
NOV 2009 COMMISSION
FILED NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR
DHC 09 DHC 13

THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT

JANET P. REED, Attorney

Defendant.

NOW COMES the defendant, Janet P. Reed, through counsel, answering the Amended Complaint of the plaintiff, alleges and says:

- 1. The allegations contained in paragraph 1 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 2. The allegations contained in paragraph 2 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 3. The allegations contained in paragraph 1 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 4. The allegations contained in paragraph 4 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 5. The allegations contained in paragraph 5 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 6. The allegations contained in paragraph 6 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 7. The allegations contained in paragraph 7 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. In addition, the District Attorney agreed that he would not object to the entry of a Prayer for Judgment Continued.

- 8. The defendant is without sufficient information with which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 8 and said allegations are therefore denied.
- 9. The defendant is without sufficient information with which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 9 and said allegations are therefore denied. However, said cases appeared as docket item number 27 on the district court calendar for February 20, 2008.
- 10. The allegations contained in paragraph 10 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. However, the document did not contain Mr. Silva's agreement not to object to a prayer for judgment continued.
- 11. The allegations contained in paragraph 11 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 12. The allegations contained in paragraph 12 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 13. The allegations contained in paragraph 13 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. Defendant denies any allegations that she knew no other charges to be added.
- 14. The allegations contained in paragraph 14 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 15. The defendant is without sufficient information with which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 15 and said allegations are therefore denied.
- 16. The allegations contained in paragraph 16 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 17. It is admitted that the defendant included file number "06 CR 703796" to the plea agreement form before she had an opportunity to discuss this matter with District Attorney, Matthew Silva.
- 18. The allegations contained in paragraph 18 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 19. It is admitted that the defendant added file number 06 CR703796 to the plea agreement after she received the same from Mr. Silva and that she had not obtained his approval prior to adding this entry to the agreement. Defendant is without sufficient information with which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of the remaining allegations contained in

- paragraph 19, and said allegations are therefore denied.
- 20. The allegations contained in paragraph 20 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 21. The allegations contained in paragraph 21 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 22. The allegations contained in paragraph 22 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 23. The allegations contained in paragraph 23 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 24. The allegations contained in paragraph 24 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 25. The allegations contained in paragraph 25 and 25(a) of plaintiff's Complaint are denied.

THEREFORE, having answered the First Claim for Relief, the defendant denies that she knowingly and intentionally violated any Rules of Professional Conduct.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 26. Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1 through 25 of her Answer as if fully set out herein in response to the allegations in paragraph 26.
- 27. The allegations contained in paragraph 27 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 28. The allegations contained in paragraph 28 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 29. The allegations contained in paragraph 29 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 30. The allegations contained in paragraph 30 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 31. The allegations contained in paragraph 31 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 32. The allegations contained in paragraph 32 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. However, defendant believes that in relation to temporary issues, this was not always the practice in Onslow County.

- 33. The allegations contained in paragraph 33 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. Further, that the mandatory custody mediation program is for contested custody issues which require that custody mediation be held prior to the hearing of those issues.
- 34. The allegations contained in paragraph 34 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 35. Defendant admits that the Motion incorrectly stated that Blakeney lived more than fifty miles from the court, which entry was a clerical mistake.
- 36. The allegations contained in paragraph 36 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. Further, as the defendant understood that the statement referred to Erica Blakeney, Bobby Blakeney's wife being unwilling to participate in any meaningful contact between Bobby Blakeney and the minor child.
- 37. The allegations contained in paragraph 37 of plaintiff's Complaint are denied.
- 38. The allegations contained in paragraph 38 and 38(a) of plaintiff's Complaint are denied.

THEREFORE, having answered the Second Claim for Relief, the defendant denies that she knowingly and intentionally violated any Rules of Professional Conduct.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 39. Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1 through 38 of her Answer as if fully set out herein in response to the allegations in paragraph 39.
- 40. The allegations contained in paragraph 40 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 41. The allegations contained in paragraph 41 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 42. The allegations contained in paragraph 42 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 43. The allegations contained in paragraph 43 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted. However, defendant thereafter advised through a fax dated March 23, 2009 that this date would not be appropriate.

- 44. It is denied that by March 25, 2009 that April 8, 2009 was the agreed upon date for the deposition. The remaining allegations contained in paragraph 44 are denied.
- 45. The allegations contained in paragraph 45 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 46. The allegations contained in paragraph 46 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 47. The allegations contained in paragraph 47 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 48. The allegations contained in paragraph 48 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 49. The allegations contained in paragraph 49 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 50. The allegations contained in paragraph 50 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 51. It is admitted that a Motion to Terminate was filed on April 8, 2009.
- 52. The allegations contained in paragraph 52 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 53. It is admitted that a hearing was held on April 30, 2009 and attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is a copy of the transcript of the hearing, the terms of which speak for itself.
- 54. The allegations contained in paragraph 54 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.

THEREFORE, having answered the Third Claim for Relief, the defendant denies that she knowingly and intentionally violated any Rules of Professional Conduct.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 55. Defendant incorporates paragraphs 1 through 54 of her Answer as if fully set out herein in response to the allegations in paragraph 55.
- 56. The allegations contained in paragraph 56 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.

- 57. The allegations contained in paragraph 57 of plaintiff's Complaint are admitted.
- 58. The allegations contained in paragraph 58 of plaintiff's Complaint are denied.

THEREFORE, having answered the Fourth Claim for Relief, the defendant denies that she knowingly and intentionally violated any Rules of Professional Conduct.

WHEREFORE, having answered the like numbered paragraphs of the plaintiff, the defendant respectfully requests that the Complaint of the plaintiff be dismissed, with prejudice, and that the North Carolina State Bar be denied any disciplinary action as a result of the allegations contained in the Complaint.

This the 30th day of October, 2009.

CRUMPLER FREEDMAN PARKER & WITT

Attorneys for the Defendant

Dudley A. Witt

State Bar #: 1/1155

301 North Main Street, Suite 700

Winston-Salem, NC 27101

(336) 725-1304

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA WAKE COUNTY

BEFORE THE
DISCIPLINARY HEARING
COMMISSION
NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR
09 DHC 13

THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR.

Plaintiff.

VS.

JANET P. REED, Attorney

Defendant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that he is an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of North Carolina, is attorney for the defendant and is a person of such age and discretion as to be competent to serve process.

That on the 30th day of October, 2009, he served a copy of the attached **ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT** by placing said copy in a postpaid envelope addressed to the person hereinafter named, at the place and address stated below, which is the last known address, and by depositing said envelope and its contents in the United States Mail at Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

ADDRESSEE:

Mr. William N. Farrell North Carolina State Bar 208 Fayetteville Street Raleigh, NC 27601

CRUMPLER FREEDMAN PARKER & WITT

Attorneys for the Defendant

Dudley A. Witt.

301 North Main Street, Suite 700

Winston-Salem, NC 27101

(336) 725-1304

EXHIBIT GAT

	NORTH CAROLINA IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE		
,	2 ONSLOW COUNTY DISTRICT COURT DIVISION		
	FILE NO: 08-CVD-4036		
4	4		
ź	KRISTIE K. OGNIEWSKI,)		
ϵ	Plaintiff,)		
7	Vs.) TRANSCRIPT		
8	RICHARD OGNIEWSKI,)		
9	Defendant.)		
10)		
11			
12	BEFORE, the Honorable JOYCE A. HAMILTON, Judge		
13	Presiding, commencing April 30, 2009, with calendar call on		
14	April 14, 2009 and April 20, 2009.		
15	APPEARANCES:		
16	TIMOTHY OSWALT, Attorney at Law, on behalf of		
17	Plaintiff.		
18	JANET REED, Attorney at Law, on behalf of the		
19	Defendant.		
20	,		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	DATE RECEIVED: 07/16/09 DATE DELIVERED: 09/08/09		
-			

1		INDEX	
2	April 14, 2009—Calendar	Call	3
3			
4	April 20, 2009—Calendar	Call	3
5			
6	April 30, 2009—Hearing		7
7			
8	Dorothy Novak		
9	Direct	By Janet Reed	52
10	Cross	By Timothy Oswalt	57
11	Redirect	By Janet Reed	62
12	Recross	By Timothy Oswalt	62
13	Redirect	By Janet Reed	63
14			
15	CERTIFICATION		79
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

(APRIL 14, 2009—Calendar Call)

COURT: Folks, we have a Motion Calendar but I think the Judge will call that Monday morning since notice would not be to some of these folks. Were there other cases that were calendared but I have not called for some reason, anybody know of any? Anyone here on a case who is wondering what is going on with your case.

(NOTHING ON OGNIEWSKY SCHEDULED AT THIS CALENDAR CALL-04/14/09) (APRIL 20, 2009-Motions Calendar Call)

COURT: I can't say this name, so I'll spell it O G N I E-

OSWALT: Ogniewski.

COURT: Thank you. Okay, same attorneys. All right, it says all pending Motions, what are they?

REED: They are dealing with our Motion to Continue.

There is uh, a Motion to Compel, there is also a Motion to

Terminate a Deposition, and I believe there's a Motion for

Sanctions.

COURT: Who's Motion to Continue?

REED: That's my, Your Honor.

COURT: So you've moved to continue everything?

REED: No, no, continue the Deposition.

COURT: Continue the Deposition. Okay, there's a Motion to Continue the Deposition, there's uh, what is this pretrial

Motion? 1 Well it's just for the Court to determine as far 2 REED: as how the Discovery and all should go before the Deposition. 3 Is it a Motion to get compel Discovery that 4 COURT: 5 hasn't-REED: No, Your Honor-6 7 COURT: What's the nature of the Motion? 8 REED: In other words, Your Honor, to, I have already requested uh, I've already done Discovery for him and provided 9 it to him, he's not provided any Discover to me other than-10 Well is it a request for sanctions, or what? 11 COURT: --(inaudible), Your Honor, what it is, Your 12 13 Honor, is I'm asking that the Court, in part of my Motion, based 14 on things as far as the Discovery process. Your time estimate on that is two hours? 15 COURT: 16 OSWALT: Judge-17 REED: Yes, Your Honor. 18 COURT: Mr. Oswalt? Judge, I think you should probably review this 19 file, there's some procedural issues as far as notice to all of 20 21 this, as far as I think a calendar request was filed prior to the Motion, uh, that's the order that I've got it in, it's uh, 22 23 it-24 COURT: Well, what are you ready to go forward on?

Judge, I can go, I filed the Motion for Sanctions

25

OSWALT:

against Ms. Reed for walking out of a deposition last week. I, uh I hadn't set that on in front of you, I had set it on in front of another Judge. I would prefer it be set on in front of the Judge that heard her Motion to continue the deposition and denied that Motion and then after that was denied, she walked out of it any way. Uhm, I'll be in a position to go forward the second week on her Motion to Compel, and her Motion uh, I'm not understanding everything that's she's filed, but I'm assuming the Motion to Compel, there's a Motion to terminate a deposition that took place a week and a half ago, and I don't understand the nature of—

COURT: Sir, you say that another Judge denied her Motion to continue the Deposition?

OSWALT: Judge, she set a Motion to continue a deposition on the day the Deposition was set. That Judge refused to hear that Motion. Uh-

COURT: So the Motion was not heard?

OSWALT: Right, it was, he just refused to hear it because there wasn't timely notice. And then after she walked out of the Deposition, the next day she filed this Motion to terminate the deposition.

REED: Your Honor, that's not-

COURT: Well, whatever there is in this file that needs to be heard this week or next week, when can you all be available for me to take a look at it and see where we're going

to then?

OSWALT: Judge, I'm available all next week. This week, I'm scheduled to be out Thursday and Friday and I got some Superior Court matters I have to deal with today, tomorrow, and I anticipate as a result of the Superior Court, it's our Administrative Court his week, but I, a local Judge, I may have some stuff on Wednesday, so I, again, if you have time next week. I'll be available.

COURT: If everything goes, next week that I've got down here, and takes the amount of time that it's on the calendar for-

OSWALT: Judge, I would consider asking if the first, I have the first matter up Thursday.

COURT: Yeah, you do.

OSWALT: Yes ma'am, and my understanding is the uh, attorney—

COURT: Well it looks to me like Thursday afternoon we might be able to do something with uh-

OSWALT: Yes ma'am, I don't think my case Thursday is going to take that, I don't think one of the parties is going to show up.

COURT: Well, then we have the Jones case. Is anybody here on the Jones case that is set next Thursday? That's half a day so-

McNAMARA: Yeah, that will probably be a visitation Order at

this point, Your Honor, it was a custody case but I think we're going to resolve the visitation, so it may not take as long as we anticipated.

COURT: Okay, well, why don't we set this for 2:00, next Thursday, does that work, Ms. Reed and Mr. Oswalt, with you?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT: Okay, so number 20 is on at 2:00. And I'll look at the file.

APRIL 30, 2009

COURT: I have looked at the file in this case and I actually made myself a note when I did calendar call last week that I needed to review the file. I think that was because at Calendar Call, I was really having difficulty determining what the issues were. But I noted on the calendar, this is an understood that this might be something we might be able to take care of this afternoon, so, give me a minute. And this is number 20 on the Motions calendar is my recollection. remember from the notes that I wrote was that there was some kind of Motion for Sanctions that Mr. Oswalt mentioned having against Ms. Reed. There was a Motion to Compel Discovery I something about think, s deposition, I don't know. Who calendared this and what's it calendared for?

REED: I calendared this, Your Honor for several, I calendared for all pending motions.

COURT: Well I need to have specifics because that could

be like 2000 motions. 2 REED: What is listed is there was a Motion to Continue, 3 there's a pretrial-COURT: Whose Motion to Continue? 4 REED: 5 It was mine. COURT: To continue, to continue what? 6 7 REED: Uh the deposition. Okay so there's a Motion to Continue-8 COURT: 9 REED: And there's also-Deposition and you represent, I'm sorry, 10 COURT: Plaintiff? IIThe Defendant. 12 REED: So these are Defendant's Motions. All right so 13 COURT: you calendared that to be heard but the deposition was 14 15 scheduled. 16 REED: Yes, Your Honor. COURT: 17 Did it take place? REED: 18 It did Your Honor to uhm-19 COURT: Is that issue moot? 20 Well, I wouldn't say moot Your Honor. REED: deposition was, was held, however during the deposition, this is 21 what the Motion for Sanctions is about is that I stopped the-Okay, well it sounds like the Motion to Continue COURT: is probably moved but might, the fact that you've made a Motion to Continue could be relevant in my hearing at the Motion for

22

23

24

Sanctions perhaps.

OSWALT: Judge, I'm sorry to interrupt but the Motions for Sanctions is not the problem.

COURT: Okay.

OSWALT: I had, I had filed that-

COURT: And it's Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions, so it's not in front of me.

OSWALT: That was set in front of Judge Seaton. I had that matter continued uh because some of the issues may resolve themselves as a result of her Motion for, to compel and her Motion to Terminate the Deposition. So based upon the results of today's hearing, I'll determine whether or not to move forward with the Motion for Sanctions.

COURT: All right, so the Motion for Sanctions is not in front of me and it sounds like the Motion to Continue the Deposition isn't because the deposition took place.

REED: It, it did, Your Honor, however-

COURT: What are the other Motions?

REED: The other issue, well going back now to the Motion to Continue the Deposition.

COURT: Okay.

REED: Your Honor, I scheduled that motion that was supposed to of been heard on April the 8th in front of Judge Foy. And at that time uh Attorney Oswalt asked the Judge to continue the Motion knowing that we had the deposition scheduled

for two o'clock on April the 8th. I was trying to bring it before the Court's attention so that we could deal with these 2 matters, and that's why it's been continued. And that's why 3 I've calendared it because he asked to have the motion 4 continued. So it wasn't dismissed, it wasn't denied, it was just 5 continued. There's also the motion, my Motion to Compel, Your 6 7 Honor, I'm withdrawing that. Okay so you had a Motion to Compel that you're COURT: 8 withdrawing? 9 Yes, Your Honor. REED:

COURT: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's also a Motion to Compel Inventory; that's REED: the ED affidavit.

There are two Motions to Compel? COURT:

No, just the first, just the one dealing with the REED: discovery that we had not received.

Okay so the Motion to Compel Discovery you're COURT: withdrawing that?

Yes, Your Honor. REED:

All right. COURT:

The Motion to Compel the Inventory, we'd like to REED: have that heard.

That is Defendant's Motion to Compel Inventory? COURT:

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

All right so you want that to be heard? COURT:

understanding you to say that you want the Motion to Continue the Deposition to be heard, is that right?

REED: Yes, yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Okay what else?

REED: Uh there's a Motion to Terminate the Deposition.

COURT: There's a Motion to Terminate the Deposition?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: That's your Motion, okay.

REED: Yes.

COURT: I'm making a note of that. All right and what else do you contend is supposed to be heard.

REED: A Motion for Real Property Appraisal.

COURT: A Motion for Real Property Appraisal.

REED: Yes and a Motion for Family Financial Mediation, ordered that be, that you know that that be done. That is part of our, our rules here.

COURT: Okay so let me make sure I understand what you're asking. You want your Motion to Compel Inventory to be heard, Motion to Continue Deposition to be heard, Motion to Terminate the Deposition to be heard, Motion for Real Property Appraisal, and Motion for Family Financial Mediation that I ordered, is that what you're asking to be heard this afternoon?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Mr. Oswalt, do you have anything that's supposed to be heard?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OSWALT: Judge, I don't have any Motions pending in front of you but I can address some of Ms. Reed's Motions.

COURT: Okay.

OSWALT: The Motion for a, uh, Appraisal, all she had to do was ask me and we would agree so I don't oppose that-

COURT: All right.

OSWALT: I mean that's just part of the process.

COURT: Let me, let me make sure I'm following you on this because there's so many Motions I don't want to get them So you don't have any objections to granting her mixed up. Motion uhm for Real Property Appraisal?

No, Your Honor. I've never, she's never asked OSWALT: for one and one's never been denied so I'm not quite sure why she calendared it. Had she simply asked me we would have agreed to have an appraisal done on the property.

COURT: Okay, what property are we talking about here?

OSWALT: It's a residence here in Jacksonville, the marital residence.

It's a marital residence? COURT:

COURT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: Uhm, I take it there's an actual Motion that specifically requests that the Court Order that is that-

OSWALT: She's filed that as part of her, there's a, there's three motions that, four motions that compiled under one Motion. The firstCOURT: And what's the name of that Motion and when was it filed?

OSWALT: Her, the header on hers, it's just called Motion.

And then it says Motion to Terminate Deposition and then there's three other motions that are attached to that.

COURT: It's got a header that says Motions and it was filed April, I can't read that it looks like the $9^{\rm th}$ is that it?

OSWALT: The copy I got wasn't filed, Your Honor.

REED: Yes April 9th.

COURT: All right I've, I've located that so and it has a Motion to Terminate Deposition in it, it has, are all the motions you contend need to be heard this afternoon, Ms. Reed, contained in that?

REED: Yes, Your Honor, I do.

COURT: I found the Motion for Real Property Appraisal contained in here and so, well I think we can take care of that without further ado. Uhm, I will order that, uhm I will grant that Motion and order that the marital residence located at 124 Robin Hood Drive in Jacksonville, uhm, be appraised. Uhm, she's asking that the parties share equally in the cost of the appraisal. Mr. Oswalt, any objection to that?

OSWALT: No. Judge, I think that's what we, we standardly do here.

COURT: Okay and she's also uh got in that Motion that she's requesting that be conducted prior to the financial

mediation which I assume you're okay with that?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: And that would kind of make sense that that would need to be done before the mediation. Okay I'll grant that Motion and that takes care of that one. All right, Mr. Oswalt?

OSWALT: Judge, she's filed a Motion for Family Financial Mediation. We're required as part of our local rules to participate in that. So I'm not quite sure what, why that's there. And-

COURT: Don't you have a form order that, or an AOC form that gets filled in to--

OSWALT: Judge, we have a coordinator that I believe works out of the Duplin County office that coordinates Family

Financial Mediation. Once it, once you file a claim for ED it automatically sets in place certain procedures that you have to name a mediator if not then the Court names a mediator.

COURT: The Court does it-

OSWALT: Yes-

COURT: So have you all discussed who the mediator might be in this case I mean-

REED: Uh Barry Hudson is fine with me,

OSWALT: Your Honor, I believe, uh normally we use Mr. Hudson, if he's available.

COURT: Okay well do I, I mean there's a Motion in front of me but I don't know that the Motion's necessary so.

REED: Well it would be to order whoever the mediator is, is going to be because we've not agreed on anybody as of, as of yet, Your Honor.

COURT: Well who's the person in Duplin County that does this?

OSWALT: Uhm,

CLERK: It's Darlene, she's in Sampson County.

COURT: In Sampson I'm sorry.

CLERK: I can get a copy of the Order and fill it out if you want me to.

COURT: Oh that sounds good. Thank you very much, let's do that and that'll take care of that then. Okay so that'll take care of that, sounds like everybody's in agreement on that and we can get that Order signed.

OSWALT: But I just-

COURT: Yes sir-

OSWALT: I just want to make sure, you're not granting the Motion?

COURT: No, I'm going to do whatever the regular method is-

OSWALT: Okay.

COURT: --for getting one appointed in this district since the Trial Court Administrator says she's got the form for doing that hopefully we can all agree on what's going to go in it and once I sign that uhm, you're going to withdraw your

Motion for Family Financial Mediation as long as I sign off on that form?

REED: Sure, Your Honor, that's fine.

COURT: Okay.

REED: I just wanted to bring it to the Court's attention so we can go ahead and move this case on.

COURT: Okay so Defendant's Motion for Family Financial Mediation is going to be withdrawn. Okay and that will leave us with the other three Motions; to compel inventory, to continue deposition, to terminate deposition. So is everybody ready to make your arguments concerning those Motions?

REED: As far as the Compelling of the Inventory, I'm not sure if there's a problem with, with I mean I haven't received anything.

COURT: Why don't you all chat about that briefly before we proceed? I think you two need to talk. That'll be a good thing.

OSWALT: Judge, I'm ready to move forward on those items.

COURT: All right okay. Ms. Reed, let me hear your argument on let's start with the Motion to Compel Inventory and let me find that Motion in here. Okay Motion to Compel Inventory Affidavit. All right, Ms. Reed?

REED: Yes, Your Honor uh this, the Complaint was filed on November, I'm sorry October of 2008. And typically what is supposed to happen is that within 90 days of the filing the

parties are, the Plaintiff is supposed to give their, their uhm ED affidavit. However, Your Honor, we have not received any of that, the ED affidavit.

COURT: The Complaint was filed November when?

REED: The Complaint was filed October of 2008.

COURT: I'm sorry October of 2008?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: What date in October?

REED: Uhm, -

COURT: It's on the bottom of the file. Okay so you're saying that they have not timely uhm, served you with their Inventory Affidavit? You've not been served with it yet?

REED: Correct, Your Honor.

COURT: Complaint was filed actually it was filed September $29^{\rm th}$, 2008. Okay well let me hear a response to that then.

OSWALT: Judge, I've been practicing law in Onslow County for 13 years. I don't know of any domestic case where anyone has ever filed here an ED affidavit within 90 days. Now Ms. Reed says typically that's the case. I think if you asked the Trial Court Administrator to look you're going to find that no one has ever done that. For the life of me I cannot recall a single case that I've ever been involved with where any party has objected to it not being filed within 90 days. Typically what we do, Judge, is we exchange discovery, which was what was done in

this
Reques
12/31
A sent
Reques
there
indic
for P
Admis

this case. I sent Ms. Reed Request for uh, Interrogatories, a Request for Production of Documents, Request for Admissions on 12/31/08. I got those back from Ms. Reed on 03/06/09. When she sent her responses to my discovery, she forwarded to me her Request For Discovery. That was sent to me on 03/06. I had a, there's an Order signed by the Clerk in the court file that indicates I have until May 8th to provide to Ms. Reed's Request for Production of Documents, Interrogatories, and Request for Admissions. In her request-

COURT: You have until May 8th?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am. And Judge, I've got a copy of what was sent to me and it in tells forty-four interrogatories, about a hundred uh requests for admissions and I think about the same request for production of documents. Within that, her request, it specifically asked for marital property, separate property, vehicles, it is, what she's asked for is for me to provide her with what she's here compelling me to provide. Uh I, I don't know whether there's a copy of interrogatories in the, in the Court file but I-

COURT: It's a thick file but I don't know the answer to that either.

OSWALT: Uhm, Judge what, what I've got-

COURT: It's a Request for Production of Documents, I saw that so it probably was.

OSWALT: She and what I'm going to just read to the Court

24

25

is uh, "Please complete Exhibit One, Affidavit of Financial Status for your income and debt." Uh she asked for uh all the forms provided for marital and separate intangible property, retirement benefits, HR, IRA's, the items that you typically see or that you do see in an Equitable Distribution Affidavit. That is what comprises her discovery that was sent to me. Uh again, Judge, that's not due until May 8th. I have been compiling it, it will be sent to Ms. Reed on or before May 8th. Uh she's filed a Motion to Compel that she's uh brought that under the Rules of Civil Procedure for Rule 36 that requires that uh there be some sort of uh statement that indicates that she had in good faith attempted to gather that information. I would ask Ms. Reed to provide me any documentation that she contends that she has sent to me indicating uh that I am uh that I haven't done what I was supposed to within the time allowed. I would contend to the Court there is nothing. There's no, there's nothing that's been sent to me. Uh she's aware of the time in which to file the response of the interrogatories. Notwithstanding that, she's filed this Motion to Compel. I would ask the Court to deny her Motion to Compel.

COURT: Well, Ms. Reed, what do you want to say in response to that? He says you brought up in pursuant to Rules of Civil Procedure and that he doesn't know of any efforts you've made to get that information from him otherwise short of filing this Motion.

REED: Your Honor, the, when he sent my client his discovery we responded back with our information. Now the discovery is not contingent upon the ED affidavit. All I'm asking for is for the ED affidavit. I did present him. I believe it was a form for him to fill out, or for his client to fill out, so and we have provided ours. However, we have not been provided anything from them about the ED affidavit. supposed to be done. As far as finding something, I'll have to look through my notebook here and look and see what I have that has asked for uh specifically for that information. I know I've sent him information uhm faxes requesting that discovery be completed. And again, and that would also go to the fact that, that the deposition was untimely done because we still had, we still are in the process. We still haven't done hardly anything. There's been no ED affidavits filed. No we don't typically file them within the 90 days. I would agree to that. However, that is what is supposed to be done. This is now several months later and it still hasn't been done. part and parcel of the discovery. What we're just asking for is for a date that this will be, that this will be done so that we can go on ahead and move on with the case.

COURT: Okay, thank you.

OSWALT: If I may be heard, Your Honor?

COURT: Sure.

I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OSWALT: Judge, the only reason why I have a financial

affidavit from Ms. Reed is because I asked for one in my discovery that was served on her at the end of December. Uh that, it's not my fault she waited until uh the time was due to respond to my discovery for her to send me discovery which is what took place. Uh there's an order in the file signed by Ms. Williams, our Clerk of Court, that states that my time to respond to her documents, interrogatories, request for admissions, be extended including May 8th of 2009 and that date hasn't arrived yet.

COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to step out and get my Rules of Civil Procedure and Chapter 50 and while I'm doing that I'd like you all to look at this form and see if you can't fill it in, by that I mean Ms. Reed and Mr. Oswalt, so I can just sign off on it as far as the uhm mediation is concerned. So I'll be back shortly; you all can take care of that.

(TAPE PAUSES AND THEN RESUMES)

COURT: --domestic rules have anything in them that addresses uhm ED affidavits? Inventories, excuse me?

OSWALT: No ma'am in fact, we have attempted to put together a Family Financial Mediation Form of Rules but last time I, I was on the committee to do that-

COURT: Well that is time consuming because I was involved in doing that in Wake County and it's no fun.

OSWALT: As of yet I don't think we have a--they've been adopted. Basically what we,--

COURT: Okay.

OSWALT: --what we do is we try to get an Affidavit prior to mediation. Uh we have a form that we, that we've agreed upon but that's basically it.

COURT: Okay, I just wanted to, if you had local rules I wanted to at least take a look at those.

REED: Well there are some rules that are published on a website though and your local rules. And I'm getting my, my paralegal just went to get my book for me.

COURT: Well I can't get online in here or if I can I don't know how. I've tried it. I can do it back there. (LONG PAUSE) See if there's anything in there about Equitable Distribution Inventory Affidavits. If there is I assume it's consistent with the statute but. And your form is called an Equitable Distribution Form, is that the inventory?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: Is there anything else in the rules about when you're required to file that? Well I don't think the local rules here are currently required all relevant documents that could include those to be exchanged five days before the settlement conference. And failure to comply with these rules can result in sanctions. Thank you very much. Well the local rules don't really address uhm the specifics. They simply say that at least five days prior to having the conference that you're to exchange all relevant information which includes the

inventory. But the General Statute 50-21 is very specific. Within 90 days after the service of the Claim for Equitable Distribution, the party who first asserts the claim shall prepare and serve upon, shall prepare and serve upon the opposing party an Equitable Distribution Inventory Affidavit blah, blah, blah, blah. The Court may extend the time limits in this subsection, and have gone one, you know, within 30 days after the service of the inventory affidavit, the party to whom the service was made shall prepare and serve an Inventory Affidavit upon the other party. But it goes on to say the Court may extend the time limits in the subsection for good cause shown uhm. I take it there wasn't any Motion for Extension in this case Mr. Oswalt in as much as both you and Ms. Reed have uh indicated that uhm apparently the attorneys in this district don't routinely file them within 90 days.

OSWALT: That's correct, Your Honor.

COURT: Okay, all right. Well do you want to make an oral Motion to extend your time at this point, Mr. Oswalt?

OSWALT: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Well it seems to me that in as much as attorneys in this district don't routinely exchange them uh during the time period set forth by the statute which are mandatory because the statute does say "shall". But in as much as that is not the uh routine practice in this district then this is how I'm going to deal with the Motion to Compel. So I'm going to uhm grant

Mr. Oswalt's oral Motion to Extend Time for, for serving the Equitable Distribution Inventory Affidavit on the Defendant to, and you said May 8th is when the discovery's supposed to be provided?

OSWALT: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: To May 8th, 2009. Now that moots your Motion to Compel at least at this point in time because I've given him an extension of time. So uhm, I, I mean if it's not provided by May 8th, which is now the, the date that I've designated, then certainly at that point you might want to go forward on your Motion to Compel, so what do you want me to do to your Motion to Compel. Do you want to withdraw it, do you want to keep it pending so that in the event it's not provided May 8th you can have it heard?

REED: Well I guess I'll just withdraw it and I'll refile it if we don't.

COURT: All right so Defendant uhm, -

REED: And that way, that way is clear.

COURT: Will withdraw his Motion to Compel Inventory
Affidavit. And that should accomplish what you want anyway
hopefully.

REED: Yes, Your Honor, that was-

COURT: Maybe not as soon as you might want it but that's the date so. All right how we doing-

REED: And I understand that in 30 days after that I

need to respond back with uhm-

COURT: Right, because it would be a shame for them to get theirs filed and served, or to serve theirs on you and not have you comply with the statute and us be in here dealing with that. All right so how are we doing on the Financial Mediation Form?

OSWALT: Judge, I think the form's been filled out.

COURT: Is that something that a Judge needs to sign here. I don't know how your local forms, yes, it is an Order.

Okay well is everybody, Mr. Oswalt and Ms. Reed, you both okay with me signing the Mediated Settlement Conference Order?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Okay. I assume ya'll communicated with the Trial Court Administrator and what's in it is uhm what you want done so I am now signing that and Ms. Reed is withdrawing her Motion for Family Financial Mediation because it's not necessary anymore. All right, all right that gets us down to the Motion to Continue the Deposition and the Motion to Terminate the Deposition. So Ms. Reed?

REED: Your Honor I do-

COURT: Oh and I'm sorry I said Ms. Reed, but let me find those Motions in here make sure I'm on the same page with you.

Motion to Terminate Deposition and was that an oral Motion that was made to continue the deposition or?

REED: No, that was a written motion it says Motion to Continue Deposition and then Amended Motion to Continue Deposition. And I believe that was filed on or about April $1^{\rm st}$.

COURT: Let me see if I can find those in the file. Believe they were filed when?

I

REED: I believe that they were filed on the 1^{st} of uh April. The second one, the amended one was filed on the, again the 1^{st} of April, at least signed and dated on the 1^{st} of April.

COURT: There's a Motion to Continue filed April $1^{\rm st}$ and an Amended Motion to Continue. All right, I've got the motions. Uh let's hear what you have to say about those.

REED: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I didn't hear what you said?

COURT: I found the Motions in the file so you may proceed with your argument concerning those.

REED: Your Honor, I do have a uh copy of the CD where that my Motion, which was for April the 8th where I asked to have uhm the deposition continued, but Mr. Oswalt asked to continue my Motion to Continue. Your Honor, I would ask if the Court would uh-

COURT: Well was an, any kind of Order signed?

REED: No, it was not signed.

COURT: In front of which Judge was that?

REED: Judge Foy. There was no Order signed.

COURT: So no Order was signed. Did he-

REED: He just-

COURT: Did he verbally Order something?

REED: He just continued because Mr. Oswalt asked to

have it continued. And as said I've got a copy of the CD from-

COURT: That you want to play.

REED: Yes.

COURT: How long does it take?

REED: Just a couple of minutes I would imagine.

COURT: All right we'll play it, if we've got the ability to do that, Madam Clerk. While you're thinking on that do you have an Order for me?

(Conversation unrelated to this case)

COURT: I tell you what let's take a fifteen minute break in this case. Let's let the Clerk see if there's any way she can set that up so we can hear it after the break and Ms. Reed if you'll consult with her maybe I can get that Order signed which I would like to get done.

(15-MINUTE BREAK)

COURT: Okay all right Ms. Reed?

REED: Your Honor, I initially filed this Motion to Continue. I got the Notice of the, of the Deposition on I believe it was on, well I've got a timeline and I guess if I can hand that up that will probably—

COURT: Okay, if you'll show that to Mr. Oswalt first.

REED: Sure.

OSWALT: I'm going to object, Judge. If she wants to testify to that she can but it supposedly relates to correspondence between my secretary and her and her secretary and stuff that she's done. And if she wanted to bring them in she could have them testify, but I'm going to object to that.

COURT: Well I guess I'll have to sustain your objection. So Ms. Reed, I mean if you want to testify yourself you certainly can do that, but if you're saying if it's somebody in your office you need to have them here.

REED: I need to have what?

COURT: You need to have them here to testify.

REED: She is here.

COURT: Ready, want to call her as a witness?

REED: Well the, we started having problems on this case, let's see on October the 8th there was a package that was uh sent over to my office and uhm we request, we made, we requested uh information about the package. That package ended up uh as-

COURT: I've actually read, while I was waiting, I read the Motion to Continue, the Amended Motion to Continue, and the Motion to uhm Terminate the Deposition, so uhm you got a package when now?

REED: We had got it on, on April the 7th. My client picked it up that day. We had gone the day before in order to uhm not the day before, the week before in order to pick up the

package.

Ī

COURT: Was that Judge Cameron's Order?

REED: Yes and Judge Cameron, and Judge Cameron ended up having to draw up a receipt for my client to sign because we could not agree on what the, on what was the language that needed to be contained in that receipt.

COURT: Okay.

REED: That was picked up on, on April the 7th. On the day I believe it was on April the 2nd when we went in for the uh went in to pick up the package, my client and myself, we were told to leave. The package was, was a big part of that, we had not had an opportunity to uh-

COURT: Was that April 2nd date before or after Judge Cameron entered those Orders?

REED: Well Judge Cameron entered his Order on March the $27^{\rm th}$. He actually signed the Order on, I believe it was on the $24^{\rm th}$ but did not, it was not filed with the Clerk's office until the $27^{\rm th}$.

COURT: Okay, okay.

REED: Now as I said we have provided them with our discovery. We had not been provided with any discovery and initially the deposition, they asked us about a date; we gave them a date my assistant, my paralegal, she said April the 8th was good. And then on the same date we sent another fax stating that that date was not good that we needed to have the receipt-

COURT: What, what date was that?

REED: That was on, that was on March 20^{th} . That was on the same date.

COURT: So on March 20th you okayed the deposition with the Plaintiff's office and then the very same day sent something saying that that date was not okay?

REED: Yes uhm let's see I'm sorry. It was on the $19^{\rm th}$ that we sent over saying that it was okay. On the $20^{\rm th}$ we sent over saying that we objected uh that we did not want to do that on the, on the uhm I'm sorry on the $23^{\rm rd}$ they said that, that that date would not be good.

COURT: Okay, March the $19^{\rm th}$ you okayed the April $8^{\rm th}$ deposition date and when did you-

REED: It was on the 23^{rd} we indicated that the date-

COURT: On the 23rd you sent written correspondence?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Saying it wasn't good, okay.

REED: Yes Your Honor and that we needed to have all discovery prior to the April 8th uh date and also to have the Order uh be signed prior to, uh prior to that time, prior to the time of the deposition. Uh we then sent a subsequent fax after we-

COURT: What, what, what order?

REED: The order by Judge Cameron we had-

COURT: Okay.

REED: We had a hearing in January and uhm at that time Ţ we asked to--there was a Motion to compel because we hadn't 2 received uh the discovery well not discovery but uh financial 3 records that had been subpoenaed and other items we had 4 subpoenaed and we had not received any of that. The package was 5 one of those items. We then calendared it for the Entry of 6 Judgment which was on March, uh I believe it was March the 20th 7 in front of Judge Cameron. Judge Cameron ended up signing the 8 Order as said on the 24th and it was entered in on the 27th of 9 March. After that time that was when the, that was when we 10 11 attempted to go to get the package that was ordered to be released uh to us. That was on, on or about April the 2nd. 12 on April the, I believe it was on April the 4th, we had to meet 13 14 with Judge Cameron so that he could work out and tell us about getting this package and what released. Judge Cameron's Order 15 indicated that, that he would, that my client would be able to 16 17 pick up the package on uhm without, without it being, without 18 being prejudiced. But what Mr. Oswalt, what Attorney Oswalt did was he, he delineated out each specific item and how much it was 19 and what the order, what the form number was. 20 These are pornographic materials that my client had never seen. 21 didn't indicate anything, anywhere on the document that it was 22 without prejudice as according to -- that he would not be prejudiced by it. Uhm, so Judge Cameron ended up writing up his own uh receipt that he wanted my client to sign. That was what

23

24

my client signed and he went to pick up the, the item on the April the uh $7^{\rm th}$ the day before the deposition. That was one of the problems. Uhm the other uh problem is that on that same day we also had a hearing-

COURT: Uhm, what same day?

REED: On the April, the March the 20th, March the 20th.

COURT: March the 20th?

REED: Of 2009. We also did a Motion for a Protective Order uh for some of the discovery, questions to Interrogatories and, and uhm and also for Request for Production of Documents. That Order has not been signed yet by Judge Cameron and we were given 20 days-

COURT: Well let me make sure I'm following you. You said that you on March the $20^{\rm th}$ you did a Motion is what you said a protective order-

REED: Well we, we, a Motion was heard.

COURT: Okay so your Motion was heard for protective order by Judge Cameron?

REED: Yes Your Honor. As well as the entry of judgment of the previous Order.

COURT: Okay.

REED: And we were, after receipt of the package by the Defendant, we were given 20 days to investigate the contents of that package.

COURT: Is there a Court Order that says that?

REED: There uhm it does not state that. That's part of Judge Cameron's Order which has not been signed yet. 2 So after receipt of the package you were given 20 3 days to review it? 4 Yeah to investigate the contents of it. 5 REED: COURT: Before what? 6 Before uhm, before responding to the uh to the 7 REED: discovery questions that uh the Judge allowed us to, time to, to 8 9 respond on. COURT: 10 But that Order by Judge Cameron has not been put 11 in writing? 12 REED: Well that that part of it was. The protective Order is what has not been put in writing. There's an Order, 13 the Order that's on for, that was entered on the 27th that one 14 did say that we had 20 days in which to investigate the 15 contents. 16 17 Okay so there is a typewritten Order that provides for them? 18 19 Yes, there is. REED: Let, let me find that. You say it was filed on 20 21 March the 27th? 22 REED: Yes, Your Honor. 23 COURT: All right let me see if I can locate it. an Order signed by Judge Cameron March 25th for February 2009. 24

That's, that was done on the 27^{th} .

25

REED:

court: Okay. Here we go. Court awarded visitation, okay, the Plaintiff and Defendant exchanged documents within two weeks of the date of this Order. Plaintiff failed to file, ooh, package is currently located at Attorney Timothy Oswalt's office where it was picked up by the Defendant to include the original box, invoice, tracking that doesn't say anything about the 20 days. Is there a separate Order that mentions that?

REED: That's the, that's, that's the-

COURT: Unless it's in the findings.

OSWALT: There's no Order, that hasn't been reduced to writing yet.

COURT: Okay.

OSWALT: What, what happened is Ms. Reed sort of rolled part of that hearing into this Order in order to facilitate the pickup of the package. Uhm, the hearing on the, there was a hearing to reduce a previous hearing to judgment and at the same time she had a, she had filed a protective order in regards to the production of documents and request for interrogatories that I had requested.

REED: That is correct Your Honor so there are two, there are two different Orders but from the same --

COURT: Give me just a minute. So there is still an Order that needs to be signed by Judge Cameron? Is that correct?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am and Judge the-

COURT: And is that the Order regarding the request for protective Order?

OSWALT: Yes. It's denying her request for protective Order. It states that it limits some of the bank records I'd asked for to specific time frames. Uhm, and it says that he shall have twenty days upon receipt of the package to respond to the request for admissions that I had sent to her.

COURT: So okay, so you agree that in this order which has not been reduced to writing that it denied her request for protective Order but gave her client uhm twenty days to review whatever was in the package before responding to your discovery request, is that correct?

OSWALT: Well it, it gave them twenty days to respond to my Request for Admissions because I had specific admissions regarding the package.

COURT: So it gave him twenty days in which to review the contents before responding to Request for Admissions?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: All right; everybody agree on that?

REED: Well, no, I believe it was to respond back on those questions of the discovery.

COURT: Well do you have that tape?

REED: No we don't Your Honor. We're probably going to have to get uh get with Judge Cameron in order to get that reduced down to writing.

COURT: Okay. Well at the very least you all can agree that your client had twenty days to review the contents before responding to something, whether it's a request for admission or productions of documents or some other discovery, is that right?

REED: Correct Your Honor.

OSWALT: Judge, it would have been the discovery that was due me uh my discovery that I sent Ms. Reed back in January that was due I believe March $5^{\rm th}$.

COURT: What, what kind of discovery were you seeking then?

OSWALT: I'd asked for the request for admissions-

COURT: Admissions, anything else?

OSWALT: Request for production of documents, and request for interrogatories, that was the extent of it.

COURT: So, all right.

OSWALT: And the only item that specific addressed this package was some request for admissions.

COURT: Okay so Judge Cameron's Order that has not been reduced to writing denied the Defendant's request for a protective Order but gave the Defendant twenty days in which to review the package before he responded to either the request for admissions, request for production of documents, or any interrogatories?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: Everybody agree on that?

REED: Well I don't agree that he denied it, he denied it on part and granted on part because there was some parts that he, he allowed.

COURT: Is Judge Cameron drafting the Order himself?

REED: No, Your Honor.

COURT: Who's drafting the Order?

OSWALT: I'm drafting the Order.

COURT: Mr. Oswalt, what were you told to put in it?

OSWALT: Judge, this is what I was told to put in there.

There was some timelines in regards to some financial documents. The Judge okayed those. Uh I had a broad request for, for some financial documents. He narrowed that request to specific timeframes. I had requested uh, a, to be, that I be allowed to have Mr. Ogniewski's hard drive on his-

I tell you what hold on for just a moment I know I asked you that question but before you go any further. For purposes of what I have to decide this afternoon, I understand that both you agree that Judge Cameron gave the Defendant twenty days to review the package contents before responding to either request for admissions, request for production of documents or interrogatories, is that correct? You both agree to that?

REED: Correct, Your Honor.

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: Is there anything else I need to know about what he did? If not let's just move on.

OSWALT: I don't think so.

l

COURT: Okay let's move on then. Great so, I know that and you all have agreed with that. Okay.

REED: Your Honor, and what we were contending, Your Honor, is that there was not sufficient time to allow the investigation of the contents prior to the deposition. And that we were in need of the uhm materials in order to participate in the deposition.

COURT: That's the, that's the guts of your argument the gist of your arguments that you didn't, your client did not have adequate time to review the contents of that package prior to the deposition?

REED: Yes Your Honor, and also just for the record I just wanted to let the Court know at the deposition we did $d\omega$ standard stipulations, I did agree to them. I just for whatever purpose that makes to the Court.

COURT: Okay anything else you want to say about your remaining motions?

REED: Uhm, we have just well we've been having a difficult time Mr. Oswalt and I with, with getting documents. We would subpoen documents, we did, we would not get a response. We, and that was the purpose, that was the basis of the Motion to Compel because we kept subpoenaing and nothing would be provided to us. We'd subpoena again there'd be nothing provided to us. And so I ended up filing uhm the Amended Motion

to Compel. As I said because this package was given, was we had knowledge of it sometime in October, October 29th of 2008 and it wasn't until April the 7th of 2009 that we even got, got to look at the package. And Judge Cameron had ordered previously that we have, that we be allowed to look at the package. You know, that we'd be allowed, we be allowed to get the package. So it took us approximately three to four months, maybe three, three and a half months, between the time that it was actually ordered, which that order is, is reduced to writing for March 27th.

COURT: Let me ask you this?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: You have a Motion to Terminate Deposition but as I understand it the deposition took place?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: I also believe, I understand that you weren't there for the entirety of the deposition?

REED: Correct, Your Honor.

COURT: So what are you asking that I do because the deposition's taken place so I can't exactly terminate the deposition. So what is that you want me to do pursuant to this Motion you filed that's called a Motion to Terminate Deposition?

REED: Pursuant to 30D, Your Honor, what I have asked, what I'm asking for is I believe that the deposition was being conducted in bad faith, and in such manners to unreasonably

annoy, embarrass or oppress the deponent. And so what I am asking for an Order for is which would allow the deposition to be suspended and resume at a later date after all of the discovery has been provided.

COURT: Okay anything else that you want to say before I hear from Mr. Oswalt?

REED: Uh no, Your Honor.

COURT: Okay, Mr. Oswalt?

OSWALT: Judge, I'll address her Motion to Continue the Deposition and her Amended Motion to Continue the Deposition first. Judge, what took place is uhm, and I have put this in a, should be labeled a Motion for Sanctions. It's not before you, but I sort of put in that the correspondence that I've gotten from Ms. Reed. I sent her a fax uhm on March 5th-

COURT: Well give me just a minute to find that even though I'm not going to be considering that today if it.

OSWALT: I think it would be helpful as far as-

COURT: Might be helpful well I've got it here so. When was uhm, that motion filed?

OSWALT: Judge, that was filed April 16th.

COURT: Motion for Sanctions?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: Okay, if you'll give me a minute to look at this Motion for Sanctions. And that was filed January wait a minute, what's the date your Motion for Sanctions was filed?

OSWALT: April 16th.

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT: I'm looking at uh an earlier Motion for Sanctions so let me disregard that one and find an April. Goodness knows I don't want to consider anything I don't have to consider. Okay I found it all right.

Judge, I have included all the correspondence OSWALT: Exhibit A is a letter that I between my office and Ms. Reed's. faxed over to her asking her uh that I would like to depose Mr. Ogniewski, what days are available? She sends me a fax back looks like on the $19^{\rm th}$ of March saying uh April $8^{\rm th}$ would be appropriate. Accordingly I sent out a uh request, a formal request to depose Mr. uh Ogniewski and served that on Ms. Reed for uhm April 8th. That's the only correspondence I got from Ms. Reed in regards to that. What it appears took place is that she filed a calendar request uh on the 31st of March and asked that all pending Motions be heard. Now at that point in time, I wasn't, there wasn't any Motions to the best of my knowledge. The next day she filed a Motion to uh, Motion to Continue the Deposition, which was filed after her calendar request. There's never been a Calendar Request submitted for this other than the ones that she submitted for this time. So that's the reason why in that case, that Motion wasn't heard I wasn't given notice. Uhm, and I think that's why Judge Foy refused to hear it. don't have any other correspondence from Ms. Reed other than her Motion to Continue the Deposition. Uh I told Ms. Reed for the

life of me I can't understand why my discovery to her has anything to do with my deposition of her client. He has asked for primary custody, we have yet to have a custody hearing. my client has custody of the child. Uh she's a school teacher and she may be moving back to Wisconsin once school gets out. So I'm in a position that I have to move forward on an issue of custody which is what I was trying to do. Uh I noticed Ms. Reed of this deposition, uh she tried to have it continued, didn't file the motion within time. Notwithstanding that I don't believe there's any grounds to continue the deposition because it's not like he's unavailable or she's unavailable. standard items that you would raise on a Motion, that I contend you would raise on a Motion to Continue Deposition is that is not held in the proper place, or the client's not available. It's none of that it's not that he's not available, it's simply that her contention is it's in bad faith because I haven't responded to the discovery which I don't have to respond to yet until May 8th. Uhm, we had, that's my argument in regards to her Motion to Continue. In regards to her Motion to Terminate the Deposition, uh she was noticed of the deposition, she appeared at the deposition. Uh she admitted to the standard stipulations, in fact she said she waived any objection to the deposition. Uhm, we started the deposition and there's a copy on that motion uh, on the Motion for Sanctions. I've included the portion of the deposition and what took place is we started the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

deposition. We went through some-

Ī

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT: Let me make sure I have that; what is it, what's your Exhibit number on that?

OSWALT: It should be Exhibit F.

COURT: I've got A, B, C, E, F, got it.

You can see Ms. Reed agrees to the standard OSWALT: We start this deposition and basically go through stipulations. some background information about Mr. Ogniewski, where he works, how long he's been there. He's a uh Lieutenant which equates to a O-3 in the Navy. We went through some of that background information about how long he's going to be uh expected to be here in Onslow County and whether or not he's going to retire anytime soon and things of that nature. Uhm, and then I asked him a question about when him and his wife resided in the state of Florida and I asked him something regards to his wife discovering on a computer that he was having an extra-marital affair that's when Ms. Reed stood up and said "I'm terminating this deposition". I asked her specifically and it's in the transcript, "Will you state for the record why you are uhm terminating this deposition?" Uh and Ms. Reed basically uh starts talking about discovery. She says, "I'm making an oral Motion to Terminate this deposition as we've requested discovery. It's being conducted in bad faith. It's done to, in a manner to be unreasonable to harass and to annoy." Uh she didn't attempt to contact the Judge as required by the Rules uh

to, to have a Judge order that the deposition be terminated. She simply on her own stood up and said, "This deposition is over with," and walked out. The next day she filed this Motion to Terminate the Deposition. And in her argument-

COURT: Let me inquire, I know she left, did the deposition proceed?

OSWALT: She left with her client.

COURT: Okay, so they both left?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: All right.

OSWALT: Uhm, in her Motion that she filed the next day, the Motion to Terminate the Deposition, her justification, and I'm looking at uhm starting with line or paragraph twenty, and that's under her Motion to Terminate the Deposition, it says, the defense, "Defendant's counsel orally made a Motion to Terminate the Deposition. That the questions presented to the Defendant were not part of any prior discovery questions; that the Defendant or Defendant's counsel was not put on notice as to the line of questioning to be presented." Uh and then it, it says that, "in order for the Defendant to actively participate in the deposition, the Defendant would need to be provided with all discovery documents and that the questions presented could have been discovered through the interrogatories." That's her justification for walking out of this deposition. Uhm, Judge, I haven't done this a very long time but I've done it long enough

to know that I'm not required to give her advance notice of what questions I intend to ask during a deposition. Uh I mean that's 2 3 the purpose of it is to gather information. Uhm, I'm not required to put her on notice. Uhm the uh, the questions she 4 contends could have been discovered through interrogatories or I 5 assume are the interrogatories that she asked my client which I 6 7 haven't yet responded to. But there's nothing in there regarding, "has your husband ever had an affair," or anything 8 9 along those lines. I mean I, it was well within my right to ask 10 that line of questions. There's no justification to terminate this deposition. Ms. Reed would have you believe that because 11 Mr. Ogniewski has not had an opportunity to examine this box and 12 I'll tell you what this is about. Uhm my client left the 13 14 marital residence, moved into a house here in Jacksonville. About uh two months after she moved out, she received a package. 15 She opened that package up and inside of it was a box of dildos 16 17 of various types and, and lubricants. I sent to Ms. Reed a 18 letter saying, "if your client sent this to my client, it 19 concerns me because she's got the children, minor children or one of them which we're fighting over, a four-year-old". 20 "if he sent this to her as a joke we don't appreciate it". Uh 21 22 the box was brought to my office and I discovered that on the box it wasn't addressed to Ms. Ogniewski, in fact it was 23 addressed to Mr. Ogniewski at the marital residence which is 24 where Mr. Ogniewski continues to reside. What has happened is 25

23

24

25

the post office took her forwarding, her change of address, and sent the box to her. So the box was sent to Mr. Ogniewski two months after they separated. He's refused to come pick this box up because he doesn't want to sign an acknowledgment that these items are his. Uh Judge Cameron said, "you can go to his office," and the order that you signed which is why it's that way, we sort of bifurcated two proceedings because we wanted him to have these, in this order it says "you can pick these items up without any prejudice. You're not acknowledging that they're yours". Well he wouldn't sign the receipts that I had when him and Ms. Reed came to my office. So Judge Cameron had to write his own receipt which he wrote three days prior to the It was only the day before the deposition that Hr. deposition. Ogniewski came to pick up this box. And Ms. Reed wants to arque that he needs twenty days to look at this box to determine whether or not he ordered it. That's her argument in regards to this box that he picked up. Nevertheless, that is not justification for walking out of this deposition that she walked in and agreed to do and that we had set up originally. that's where we're at.

COURT: Okay.

OSWALT: Judge, what I'm asking for is that you deny, my argument would be if she wanted to terminate this deposition she should have, at that point in time, made a motion to, to suspend, attempted to contact some sort of judge, and I think

that requires, the statutes require that you attempt to contact the District Court Judge that's in session or another District Court Judge to argue the issue of bad faith uh, to determine whether or not the deposition goes in. She didn't do that. She was upset that Judge Foy didn't hear her, her motion to terminate or suspend the deposition and had no, my position is she had no intent to follow through with the deposition and, and the first question that I asked him that was controversial she, she stopped and got out. I'm asking that you deny that Motion to Terminate and I'm asking pursuant to that if it's denied, I think I'm entitled to attorney's fees. I'm asking, what I'm-Well you told me you didn't want me to hear the Motion for Sanctions today so I'm just. OSWALT: Well Judge I still think that's why I postponed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OSWALT: Well Judge I still think that's why I postponed the Motion for Sanctions because I think under this if she makes a Motion to Terminate a Deposition and that is denied, I think it's within your right to, to, to, to apply attorney's fees and what other necessary measurements you deem appropriate. All I'm asking for Judge is that she, he be ordered to attend this deposition, that they, they pay for the deposition, and they pay my fees for the deposition. I've already, I blocked off a whole afternoon, I've already paid the Court reporter. Uh but for her comment we would have completed this deposition already.

COURT: Well give me just a minute and let me make sure. So you're asking that I award attorney's fees, if I grant the

Motion to Terminate, that I award attorney's fees for you having to reappear at another deposition, and pay, and that they also pay for the Court reporter services for that is that what you're asking?

OSWALT: I think if you deny their motion then I'm entitled to attorney's fees and you can order her to pay for the next deposition.

COURT: And you're asking for attorney's fees for this hearing on the Motion to Terminate?

OSWALT: No, all I'm asking for is that she pay my fees for the next deposition.

COURT: For the next deposition okay that's what I wanted to get clear okay. Are you also asking that she pay the Court reporter's fees?

OSWALT: That she pay for the, for the next deposition. I've already paid for the first deposition.

COURT: Okay Ms. uhm Reed, I'm not going to rule on the Motion for Sanctions but some of it may fall by the wayside by virtue of what I do today. However, he's got a number of allegations in here that he's just argued uh with regard to events that occurred so I'll hear any response you want to make to what he just said now. And I think that there are two main ones and somebody correct me if I'm wrong but one of them is he said Judge Foy refused to hear your Motion to Continue or Motions to Continue and it's Mr. Oswalt's position that they

were not properly calendared. Uh I've heard what Judge Foy had Ī 2 to say on the tape. He doesn't indicate why he's not going to hear them but he just said he wasn't going to hear them. 3 4 and he knew that the deposition obviously was set that 5 Uhm, the second argument is that Mr. Oswalt's contending that you did not properly uh proceed with your Motion 6 7 to Suspend the Deposition once the deposition had gotten 8 started. And because of that he wants you to, he wants me to 9 deny the Motion to Terminate and order that you pay the cost of the next deposition and his attorney's fees, is that what you're 10 arguing in a nutshell?

> OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT: Okay, Ms. Reed I'll hear your response to that.

REED: Okay, thank you Your Honor. I have a, what I have marked as Defendant's Exhibit Two and these were the correspondence prior to deposition being, uh conducted.

COURT: If you'll show those to Mr. Oswalt.

REED: I have, I've given him a copy of it and-

COURT: And do you want those to be received in evidence for the purposes of this hearing?

REED: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Mr. Oswalt, do you have any objections?

OSWALT: No, Your Honor.

COURT: Okay if you'll pass those up. Give me a minute to look at that before you go further. Okay Ms. Reed.

REED: Your Honor, as far as uhm Mr. Oswalt's uh contention that it wasn't properly noticed, he never made that allegation that it was not properly noticed. I didn't hear anything where he had says that it was not properly noticed. Your Honor, we sent him the calendar request. We sent him a notice of hearing.

COURT: Do you have the Calendar Request or Notice of Hearing or the Motion to Continue to be heard?

REED: I, yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Let's see that's the motion, the original Motion to Continue was filed it was dated April $1^{\rm st}$ and the Amended Motion was also dated April $1^{\rm st}$ so, calendar request that you're referring to--

REED: I'm referring to the second one my Motion to Continue was done on, on the $1^{\rm st}$. The calendar request was also done, the amended one was done on the $1^{\rm st}$ as well.

COURT: Do you have a copy of that?

REED: Uhm, -

COURT: On those appearing for that. Well here's a notice of hearing dated March the $31^{\rm st}$.

REED: We tried, we initially tried to calendar for the $7^{\rm th}$ except for that was one of those Grand Jury dates.

COURT: Well I've got a notice of hearing that says, is dated March the $31^{\rm st}$ which actually predates the Motion to Continue on April $1^{\rm st}$. Is there another notice of the one you

did after March the 31st?

REED: I'm looking Your Honor, I believe that we had done-

COURT: I mean that obviously was done prior to the motion being filed so--

REED: Yes Your Honor that, that is correct. The only calendar request was done on the $31^{\rm st}$.

COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

REED: Your Honor, as to uhm I don't believe that he had raised that prior to the hearing for uhm, for this, that he received the Motion to Continue, he knew that this is what we were trying to do, he received my faxes indicating that, you know, that we had that we did not receive the discovery and that we needed that prior to the deposition being conducted. And Your Honor, I have my uhm my paralegal here that can also state that he, she was told by his assistant that we could have the discovery prior to the deposition being conducted. Uhm, when I realized that that did not appear be the case and we did not have any further uh correspondence or anything other than the notice of, other than the Notice of Deposition. I understood that he intended to take the deposition regardless of what the paralegal had, had stated and I'm prepared to put her, call her-

COURT: If you want to call her as a witness you may.

REED: If you will, I'll call Dorothy Novak.

DOROTHY NOVAK, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY JANET REED:

İ

- Q: Would you state for the record your name and address?
- A: Dorothy J. Novak, 139 Hubert Blvd. Lot 191 Hubert, North Carolina.
- Q: And where are you employed?
- A: Attorney Janet Reed as a paralegal.
- Q: All right and would you tell the Court about the events that transpired prior to the deposition being scheduled.
- A: We got a fax on March 5th from Bobby Jo Cox at attorney Oswalt's office asking that we do a deposition during late March. In response uhm we talked back and forth, me and Bobby Jo about some dates, looked on your calendar, looked on her calendar, on Mr. Oswalt's calendar. Uh April 8th was determined that that was the two days that you both were free. Sent it over to confirm asking if it was acceptable, never got anything back. Sent a fax the 23rd of March saying that, you know, it's not going to be acceptable as we don't have the discovery, we don't have the prior orders, we don't, it's not a good time to have the deposition. Well then later that day or the next day, I'm not really sure what day, but I talked to Bobby Jo.
- COURT: Are you referring this exhibit, Number Two?
- 23 A: That's yes, yes ma'am that's the first fax that was sent.
- 24 COURT: Okay.
 - A: And then the other ones are in there too. Uhm, later that

day or the next day I spoke with Bobby Jo. Objection to anything she said unless she's here. 2 COURT: Sustained. 3 So that means I cannot answer, correct? Okay uhm-4 All right so were you given an indication that the 5 discovery would be forth coming? 6 OSWALT: Objection leading. 7 Sustained. COURT: 8 Was there, was there a condition for the deposition? 9 OSWALT: Objection. 10 Π COURT: Sustained. Did you receive any responses back to the faxes on the 29th 12 and on the 23^{rd} ? 13 No we got a Notice of Deposition was sent to us from 14 attorney Oswalt. Then once I received that from you, I sent a 15 16 fax to Bobby Jo as well as attorney Oswalt stating that you know maybe it was on oversight on their behalf because we had said 17 that April 8th was not going to be acceptable due to the 18 discovery and the discovery we didn't receive as we discussed. 19 And never got anything back with that and here we are today. 20 So you did, did you get anything back in writing? 21 Q: **A**: No. 22 23 Did you get a phone call back? I did from the March 23rd fax saying that the discovery 24

would be forthcoming.

OSWALT: Objection. 1 Sustained. 2 COURT: Based on your conversation, based on your conversation did 3 Q: you believe that, that the-4 Objection as to what she believes? 5 OSWALT: COURT: Sustained. 6 7 Based, well after the conversation, did you believe that Q: the deposition was still being held? 8 Objection as to what she believes? 9 COURT: Sustained, do not answer that. 10 So on the 23rd during that conversation what did you state 11 12 to Ms. Cox? That we were in need of discovery prior to the deposition. 13 In response she said-14 Objection to what she said. 15 OSWALT: COURT: Sustained you can't tell us what she said. 16 would be hearsay. 17 All right but you stated that the discovery was needed 18 prior to that? 19 20 Prior to deposition correct and the prior orders needed to be signed. 21 Did, at that point, you take the uh the uh April 8th date 22 off of our calendar? 23 A: Yes. 24

Was that based on that conversation?

A: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

COURT: And that was Bobby Jo what's her full name?

A: Cox, Bobby Jo Cox.

Q: And then when, when you received the notice of deposition dated March the $25^{\rm th}$, then what happened?

A: I sent a fax saying that you know, we didn't have anything and that maybe it was an oversight because we had talked about it not being on that day.

Q: Okay. Now the initial uhm document that you sent over on the $19^{\rm th}$ of March 2009, uhm the initial document where you sent over stating that the, the deposition for April $8^{\rm th}$ was, you know, would be acceptable.

A: And it was based on availability of both attorneys. We both said both attorneys would be available on these certain days, let's work out a day, and then I faxed it over saying would this be acceptable.

Q: And did you hear a response back to that?

A: Not immediately no.

COURT: The second fax, was that dated March the 29^{th} ?

A: 23^{rd} ; it was the 23^{rd} .

COURT: Okay there's one the 29^{th} also.

22 A: Yes, there's three total, I think.

Q: And that was actually sent over on March 30th 2009 at 9:30?

A: Correct.

Q: The confirmation sheet is attached?

Correct. **A**: Have we been having difficulty with getting the discovery-2 Q:Objection. OSWALT: 3 COURT: Overruled. 4 Yes or if I can answer it. 5 A: COURT: Yes ma'am. 6 7 A: Okay. What, what, what have those uhm problems been? 8 Up until March 15th we didn't receive anything at all 9 A: through subpoenas, motion to compels, nothing. We've gotten 10 nothing, until March 15th. We got some bank statements from 11 12 October, November, and December and-Do you mean April 15th? 13 0: April 15th, I'm sorry yes, April 15th. Uhm, we got some bank 14 statements and some pay stubs and that's all we've received. 15 And were there uh were there two previous subpoenas that 16 Q: were issued? 17 Yes. 18 A: And was there a subpoena issued for uhm for a later term Q: that still has not been complied with? A: Yes, yes. And was there a subpoena for the April 20th term? Q: Yes. A: And has that been complied with?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe we asked for an itinerary and proof of

income. Nothing further, Your Honor. 2 REED: Cross examination? COURT: 3 CROSS EXAMINATION 4 BY TIM OSWALT: 5 Well Ms. Reed, can't sign subpoenas can she? 0: 6 Not to my knowledge, no sir. A: 7 She'd have to have the Clerk sign subpoenas? 8 I do believe so, yes sir. And why is that? 10 0: Uhm, I'm unaware. It was before I was employed there. 11 A: That's because she would send out subpoenas the day before 12 hearings, is that correct? 13 I don't know. That was before I was employed. 14 A: How many Motions to Quash have been filed in this case? 15 I believe one, maybe two. 16 Two, and that's because my client was served uh both times 17 with subpoenas the day before the hearing, is that right? 18 I don't know what day she was served, however I know what 19 days they were sent out. They were sent out to the Sheriff and 20 if they didn't serve it till the day before that is not our 21 responsibility. 22 But you were aware that those were served the day before 23 the hearing? 24

And they were faxed to your office as well.

Correct. A: 2 Have we been having difficulty with getting the discovery-OSWALT: Objection. 3 4 COURT: Overruled. 5 A: Yes or if I can answer it. COURT: Yes ma'am. 6 7 A: Okay. 8 What, what, what have those uhm problems been? Up until March 15th we didn't receive anything at all through subpoenas, motion to compels, nothing. We've gotten 10 11 nothing, until March 15th. We got some bank statements from October, November, and December and-12 Do you mean April 15th? 13 Q: April 15th, I'm sorry yes, April 15th. Uhm, we got some bank 14 A: 15 statements and some pay stubs and that's all we've received. 16 Q: And were there uh were there two previous subpoenas that were issued? 17 A: Yes. 18 And was there a subpoena issued for uhm for a later term 19 Q: that still has not been complied with? 20 21 **A**: Yes, yes. And was there a subpoena for the April 20th term? 22 23 A: Yes. And has that been complied with? 24 Q:

I believe we asked for an itinerary and proof of

income. REED: Nothing further, Your Honor. 2 Cross examination? COURT: 3 CROSS EXAMINATION 4 BY TIM OSWALT: 5 Well Ms. Reed, can't sign subpoenas can she? 6 0: Not to my knowledge, no sir. 7 A: She'd have to have the Clerk sign subpoenas? 8 0: I do believe so, yes sir. 9 A: And why is that? 10 Q: Uhm, I'm unaware. It was before I was employed there. 11 That's because she would send out subpoenas the day before 12 0: hearings, is that correct? 13 I don't know. That was before I was employed. 14 A: How many Motions to Quash have been filed in this case? 15 16 I believe one, maybe two. Two, and that's because my client was served uh both times 17 Q: with subpoenas the day before the hearing, is that right? I don't know what day she was served, however I know what 19 **A**: days they were sent out. They were sent out to the Sheriff and 20 if they didn't serve it till the day before that is not our 21 responsibility. 22 But you were aware that those were served the day before 23 Q: the hearing? 24 And they were faxed to your office as well.

- Q: Right. Uh you're asking for the same information that you asked in the uh request for production of documents,
- 3 interrogatories, is that right?
- 4 A: Some yes.
- 5 Q: And none of that's due until May 8th, is that correct?
- 6 A: Yes.

- 7 Q: All right we had a hearing in front of Judge Cameron, Judge 8 Cameron said you had twenty days to respond to that discovery,
- 9 is that not correct?
- 10 A: Discovery, clarify.
- II Q: Subpoena that you sent out.
- 12 A: The package-
- 13 Q: Right.
- 14 A: In particular.
- 15 Q: The subpoena that you sent asking for her pay stubs, is
- 16 that not correct?
- 17 A: He said twenty days from the order the 27th the date he ordered not the subpoena I don't know if that's the same.
- 19 Q: When, the order was signed on the 23^{rd} and it was sent to 20 me on the 27^{th} , is that right?
- 21 A: Correct and it was twenty days from that.
- 22 Q: Right so you received all that stuff within twenty days
- 23 from the date I received this order?
- 24 A: April 15th if that's 20 days.
- 25 Q: It is isn't it?

- A: I would assume. I mean it was pretty close.
- 2 Q: Okay so you've gotten all the discovery is that not 3 correct?
- 4 A: We did not get all the discovery.
- 5 Q: Why?
- A: We have bank statements from October, November and December
 we have none from January, February, March. We do not have no
 First Command bank accounts which she has.
- 9 Q: But those, those come with the discovery that Ms. Reed 10 asked for?
- A: However it was subpoenaed and ordered in that March 27th order and we didn't receive it.
- Q: Okay uhm you sent over to my office a date of April 8^{th} to do this deposition, is that right?
- 15 A: Yes sir.
- 16 Q: Uh and then after that you sent a letter on the 23^{rd} and this is you, Ms. Novak-
- 18 A: A fax not a letter a fax.
- 19 Q: Fax.
- 20 A: Yes on the 23^{rd} .
- Q: It says per Ms. Reed after speaking with your client we would like to resolve the outstanding order. So your client
- 23 didn't want to do this deposition?
- 24 A: True.
- 25 Q: Okay.

- Until we had orders and discovery completed. **A**:
- All right, so did you ever receive anything from me other Q: 2 than this notice to take deposition? 3
- From you directly? 4 A:
- 5 Q: Right.

1

9

10

- Any faxes or anything we got was from Bobby Jo. 6
- Did you ever get anything indicating that this deposition 7 0: had been rescheduled or was going to be rescheduled? 8
 - Just the conversation I had with Bobby Jo that we would A: have everything before the date.
- You never received any, what I'm asking, did you ever 11 receive anything from me indicating that I was going to 12 reschedule this deposition? 13
- No sir. 14 **A**:
- All right and when did Ms. Reed file her motion to continue 15 this deposition? 16
- It was prepared the 30^{th} , 31^{st} time frame, filed around the 17 A:
- Unless I see it I can't give you exact dates. 18
- Well you would agree that she filed a, a calendar request 19 asking for all pending issues, is that right? 20
- All pending motions not issues but motions. 21 A:
- Well at the time she filed that she had not filed a Motion 22 0: to Continue the deposition?
- True there was other motions pending though I do believe. A: 24
- Okay but she hadn't filed her Motion for Deposition is that 25

correct? 2 **A**: Correct. All right and I think our general rules here in Onslow County require you to give ten days notice, is that right? 4 5 I'm not aware, I can't tell you. 6 I mean you, you file the paperwork. 7 From what I've known to see, yes. Your general practice is you give somebody ten days notice 8 9 for a motion? Uh calendar request is two weeks, motions I do not know. 10 Okay we never got a calendar request but-11 It was faxed, it was faxed to your office. I faxed it 12 myself. 13 14 You faxed a calendar request when? The day it was prepared, that March 30^{th} , 31^{st} date. 15 faxed to your office. 16 17 You didn't file this motion to, to continue until the 1st. 18 So did you fax me a calendar request that day? 19 A: No sir, it was faxed the day prior. So you faxed the calendar request prior to filing the motion? It wasn't filed at the courthouse at the time I sent it to A: you.

Q: Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

It was filed at the courthouse the day after. It gets sent

out before it's filed. That's all. 2 OSWALT: REDIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY JANET REED: 4 Ms. uh Novak, uh you're familiar with Rule 6 of the North 5 Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure? 6 **A**: A little yeah. 7 And you're aware that for motions that uhm that they can be 8 served not later than five days before the specified date of the hearing? 10 If that's what the rule states, yes ma'am. 11 12 Q: Okay. Nothing further, Your Honor. REED: 13 Mr. Oswalt? COURT: 14 RECROSS EXAMINATION 15 BY TIM OSWALT: 16 Ma'am, did Ms. Reed have any intent to complete this 17 deposition when she came over to my office? 18 Yes sir. A: 19 Do you know why she up and walked out of it? 20 You were asking questions that she didn't have knowledge of 21 and neither did her client and there was no, no idea of what the 22 questions were even remotely about anything that you were 23 talking about. So there was no prior notice of it either. 24

How long have you been a paralegal?

REED: Nothing further, Your Honor.

COURT: Mr. Oswalt?

OSWALT: Nothing further.

COURT: Thank you ma'am you may step down. Okay Ms. Reed any further evidence you want to present if not I'll hear any further argument you want to make?

REED: Yes, Your Honor, I did just-

COURT: Bearing in mind that the big, the two big issues that Mr. Oswalt has raised I believe to be uh lack of proper notice hearing on your motions to continue and he also contends that you did not file a proper legal procedure for terminating the deposition.

REED: Your Honor, as to my reading of Rule 30D.

COURT: I've got it so go ahead. Took me a few minutes to locate it but I've got it right in front of me.

REED: I did, I believe that I followed what I believed to be uh the rule that I did need to uhm, to make the motion and that was what I did and I calendared because I don't want to go through an ex parte communication with the Judge without giving him prior notice of it. And that was why it was uh why I calendared it as quickly as possible, so that we could get this resolved so that we could move on with the case and get this, and get everything taken care of, Your Honor. Uhm, in my reading I do not believe that, that I'm required to immediately leave the, leave the deposition and go and uh come up to the

courthouse and look for a for a judge but to go on ahead and get the motions filed and get them calendared so that there's not uhm any sort of appearance of impropriety. Your Honor, as to, you know, if I was wrong in, in doing that, Your Honor, I would apologize. However, and I would, you know, would uhm would agree, Your Honor, if, you know, if I'm wrong to you know to pay Mr. Oswalt's attorney's fees and to pay for the previous deposition that did not go. But not for the new deposition because he still would have to do a deposition regardless. There are still items that are still outstanding which is what brought us here today. There's still the ED affidavit, there was still the ED affidavit. So that there would have had to have been another deposition that would have had to been scheduled anyway if we didn't have all the, all the necessary evidence in which to go forward, Your Honor. I, I know that I was very frustrated with all, with everything that was, that was going on and I did have the intent to go on ahead and to do, uhm the deposition. I was hoping that things would have, you know would have worked out. Uhm, you do have a copy of the transcript included in his motion for the sanctions. It was not my intention to try to uhm delay anything, we just want to do things in good order, Your Honor. We just want to make sure, as I said, my paralegal when she said sent the first letter she just asked about just the dates. Uh she didn't get a response back and then sent back the additional uh faxes. Your Honor, we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

believe that that was in bad faith. And yes I did agree to the stipulations and the standard stipulations. I did agree to those. I do admit that. And that's, that's just, you know, where I, where, where we are, Your Honor. As far as the notice of uh of that, Your Honor, we believe, I believe that according to uhm, I believe its Rule 5 of Civil Procedure that it's five days notice, ten days is for child support or custody issues, but five days for anything less than that. At least five days. And he had, he had more than then five days notice. Your Honor, we would ask, as I said, that you would grant, it's not really to terminate it but to suspend it. We understand that we need to do the deposition and we would want to do that as soon as possible after the uhm May $8^{\rm th}$ documents are received. Honor, in your consideration you know if you'd like for me to pay for, to pay for it, I have not problem with that.

COURT: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REED: With doing it, thank you.

court: Well this is unfortunate. It's unfortunate that everybody's here this afternoon is spending more time dealing with this but you're here and so I'll try to make the best decision I can. I'm trying to find the file stamped copies of your Motions to continue. I know they're dated April 1st. I was looking at copies that were actually attached to the Motion for Sanction so. Uhm, I don't know if they were filed April 1st or when. Okay looks like they were filed actually on April 2nd and

signed April 1st. That's the amended motion though, I'm checking the original motion. The original hmm, okay, the original Motion to Continue appears to be signed April 1st and filed April 1st. And the Amended Motion to Continue is also dated April 1st and filed though on April 2nd is what it looks like. And the notice of hearing that indicated that all pending motions were to be heard was filed, dated and filed on March the 31st.

I

REED: Your Honor, also I just wanted to bring to your attention to under 30(d) it says upon demand of the objecting party or deponent the taking of the deposition shall be suspended for the time necessary to make the Motion for an order and that was what we did, uh in trying to comply with the uhm with the rule.

that the intent of that rule which is entitled "Motion to

Terminate or Limit an Examination", is that the party wanting to

terminate or limit the examination of the deposition uhm,

should, and it's intended that they should, try to get a judge

to rule on that as soon as possible. Uhm, it says that any time

during the taking of the deposition on a motion of a party or of

the deponent and upon a showing that the examination is being

conducted in bad faith or in such manner is to unreasonably

annoy or embarrass or oppress the deponent or party, a Judge of

the Court in which the action is pending, or any Judge in the

county where the deposition is being taken, may order, before whom the examination is being taken, to cease forthwith from taking the deposition or may limit the scope and manner of the taking of the depositions provided in Rule 26(c). If the order, and of course we don't have one and that's what you're here about today, may terminate the examination it shall be resumed thereafter only upon the Order of the Judge in the Court in which the action is pending. Upon demand of the objecting party or deponent the taking of the deposition shall be suspended for the time necessary to make a Motion for an Order. Uhm, and then it refers to the expense section let me go look at expenses. Well I have that portion of the deposition in front of me, uhm, which reflects what Ms. Reed said when she terminated the deposition. And she said, "At this point, pursuant to Rule 30, I'm making an oral motion to terminate this deposition as we have requested discovery. This deposition is being conducted in bad faith and is done in such a manner as to be unreasonable, to harasses, annoy or oppress the deponent. We were due discovery yesterday. We have not gotten it and we have filed a Motion to Compel. So at this point we are demanding that this deposition be suspended until further orders of the Court." Uhm, and I've looked back to see when she filed her Motion to Terminate Deposition, and the Motion to Terminate was filed on April, it was signed on April the 9th, I'm not sure when it was filed. don't have the file stamped copy handy. But apparently the very

ì

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

next day she drafted uhm a Motion to Terminate Deposition. So I quess the real issue is whether uh that was timely, pursuant to Rule 30 because it does say, "upon demand of the objecting party or deponent the taking of the deposition shall be suspended for the time necessary to make a Motion for an Order." And she did demand, because she said she was, that the deposition be suspended until further orders of the Court. She didn't say specifically until I can draft a Motion and get it in front of a Judge for it to be heard but uhm I think that's implicit in what she actually said. And in as much as she had already been in Court earlier that day trying to get a Judge to hear her Motion to Continue, uhm I think Ms. Reed was being pretty diligent about what she was doing. So the only question is had she been able to locate a Judge that day or even prior to the day who could hear this Motion to Terminate would the Motion to Terminate have been granted. Well for a Judge to grant it, a Judge would have had to find that it was conducted, the deposition was being conducted in bad faith or in such a manner as to unreasonably annoy, embarrass or oppress the deponent or party, blah, blah, blah. And I've had Ms. Novak up here who's testified about these faxes going back and forth, but the last one was on, the last one was on March the 29th where she indicated there, maybe there was some misunderstanding about the deposition going forward and of course at that point she knew the deposition was scheduled and everything was in place for it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to happen. And uhm, and then Ms. Reed files her Motion to Continue but doesn't do a notice of hearing on the Motion to Continue and a Judge didn't want to hear it at the last minute on the very day the deposition's being heard, so there we are. Uh well I don't know what your, Mr. Oswalt, your paralegal or secretary or whoever, whatever her title is would say if she were here about what communication she had with Ms. Novak but uhm there have been some communication problems in this case. And not just about the deposition but apparently about a number of other things, but anyway. Okay having said all of that give me just a minute and I'll tell you want my decision is. Well Mr. Oswalt, I'm going to ask you to draft the Orders.

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: I'm going to deny the Defendant's Motion to

Continue Deposition. It's kind of weird that I'm doing that

because the deposition's already, had, didn't, was not completed

on April the 8th but it began so I'm not sure but what that is

moot, but at any rate. Uhm, be that as it may I'm going to make

a ruling on it that we can put on record so I'm going to deny

the Motion to Continue Deposition. And I'm going to deny it on

the basis that the uhm Defendant failed to serve notice of

hearing on the Plaintiff of the hearing of those Motions. And

the reason I'm making that decision is there was a Motion of

hearing that was filed on March the 31st but Defendant's

original Motion to Continue Deposition which is dated April 1st,

was filed April 1st. Defendant's amended Motion to continue deposition, which is also dated April 1st, was not filed until April 2nd, and no Motion of Hearing, no Motion of Hearing was served after the date of uh, the date on those respective motions, either the actual date they were prepared or the filing date so no motion -- Notice of Hearing was served after the filing of the Motions to Continue. And that's why I'm going to deny the Motions to Continue. I have no idea what somebody else might have done with those if they've been calendared properly, etc. but at any rate that's the reason I'm going to deny it. Now, the Motion to Terminate Deposition is another matter. Uhm, I'm going to find that the Motion to Terminate Deposition has been properly made under Rule 30(d), in that the Defendant indicated that she, Defendant's attorney, indicated that she was demanding that the deposition be suspended until further orders of the Court which implies that she needed an opportunity to make a Motion, or to draft, well let me say make, to make a Motion to Terminate the proceedings before a Judge and obviously needed time to do that. She in fact drafted a Motion the very next day. So I'm finding that she properly, has properly made her Motion to Terminate so then the issue becomes whether the Motion should be granted or not because it was properly made. hear any further brief argument that either one of you wants to make about whether the Motion to Terminate should be granted. And obviously the basis for it to be granted is and you said

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

H

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this at the deposition but it's your burden of proving it uhm that the Motion has to be based upon a showing that the examinations conducted in bad faith were in such manner as to unreasonably annoy, embarrass or oppress the deponent or parties. So anything further you want to say about that Ms. Reed?

REED: Yes, Your Honor. My client is not here so he's not able to, to testify uh it's the part that was due to the box not having, you know, there was already an order entered that said that we were supposed to get the box. We did not get the Discovery. Your Honor, my client felt from what he, from what he relayed to me was that he felt as though the purpose of it was to annoy, embarrass and oppress him.

COURT: Okay, thank you.

REED: Thank you, Your Honor.

COURT: Anything further, Mr. Oswalt.

OSWALT: Judge, if you read the pleadings, this is a contested custody case. But he's asking to be awarded primary custody of a four year-old-girl that my client currently has custody of. I noticed him for a deposition. Uh we moved forward with it, he agreed, Ms. Reed agreed on his behalf the standard stipulations that there wouldn't be any objection to it. Uhm, everything was done in, in good faith. We did not, he didn't have any plans to go anywhere, didn't have any vacation, didn't have to come from, he's local. Her contention that the

discovery wasn't presented to him has no bearing on this, you know, because I'm going to ask him questions about stuff that I need to know. And what he has inquired from my client has nothing to with his deposition. Nothing to do with it. they believe if they had gotten my client's discovery that they had requested, they would be prepared for all of these line of questioning. But, but they never asked my client any of that. Uh Judge, and Ms. Reed's contention that he would have been deposed anyways makes no sense. I mean she's not going to depose her own client based upon the discovery that I give her and she requested it. That just doesn't make sense. Uh you can read what took place in the deposition. None of that was done in bad faith. I was polite to him, I, I asked him questions. It, it was a standard deposition. Nothing was done out of the ordinary until I asked a question he wasn't prepared for. I'm sorry but that's my job is to gather information. If he wasn't prepared that in itself is not bad faith, that is not unreasonable, that's not oppressive. Uh I don't think they were prepared for the deposition but that doesn't make it unreasonable or in bad faith on my part. So I would ask that you deny her Motion to Terminate the Deposition.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REED: Your Honor, based on that I would still, I would state though that we would still have had to have had another deposition because we still had not exchanged the ED affidavit.

There were still things that we would still have to deal with so

the deposition would not have been able to fully go through that date. And his answers probably would have changed based on the fact that there were things that he did not know.

COURT: Thank you. Okay I'm going to deny the Motion to Terminate. And again Mr. Oswalt, I want you to draft this Order.

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Uhm, and I'm going to find that the, in denying the Motion to Terminate, I'm going to find that the Defendant appeared for the deposition, that he answered a number of questions, uhm I'm not sure how many and I don't want you to have to count them. Uhm, I'll just say that he answered numerous questions; that he appeared at the deposition, that he answered numerous questions knowing that he had not received discovery. And apparently he did not want to continue with the deposition only at the point when he was asked about uh his wife's discovery of an internet relationship that he might be having with someone. I'll conclude that the deposition was not conducted in bad faith and was not done in such a manner as to be unreasonable or to harass, annoy or oppress the deponent. And I will order that the Defendant pay the expense of the partial deposition that took place on April 8th to include Mr. Oswalt's attorney's fees. Mr. Oswalt, I don't know if you can tell me what the cost of that partial deposition was?

I don't have it with me at this point in time,

Your Honor.

COURT: Okay well are you both in town tomorrow or is somebody going to a CLE?

OSWALT: Judge, I think we're both in front of you tomorrow.

COURT: Oh you're both on the case I have tomorrow, wonderful. Mr. Oswalt and Ms. Reed, I'd like not to leave any loose ends if I can help it for some other Judge to have to deal with, in particularly in this case I would prefer not to leave loose ends. Is there any chance tomorrow when you come that you can uhm have an affidavit of your attorney's fees as well as the cost of the Court reporter-

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: For the deposition?

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: Okay so tomorrow then I'll set the attorney's fees and the cost of the deposition. I don't know if you can get the rest of the Order drafted. If you could get everything else drafted and have a blank in it that would be wonderful for me to fill in but you tell me, its 4:30 almost so. I've been pushing people all week to get me Orders; I know you saw me pushing Ms. Reed earlier to get that one signed in that other case.

OSWALT: Uhm, I will certainly try to have something for you. I-

COURT: And Ms. Reed let's see, I'd ask you to draft the Order and which is, should be short, sweet and to the point, and if you could bring that to me tomorrow I'd appreciate it on your Motion for Real Estate Property Appraisal. Uhm, all I said was that both parties were to share in the cost of the appraisal equally and it's to be done prior to financial mediation so. And then Mr. Oswalt, I needed you to draft an Order extending the time for serving the ED inventory affidavit-

OSWALT: Yes ma'am.

COURT: -to May the 8th, 2009. And then the only other
Order would be the one that I've just done on this Motion to
Terminate and the Motions to Continue so. Well I guess I'll see
you all in the morning.

REED: Your Honor this should--

COURT: Oh wait a minute, wait a minute I've overlooked something. Give me a minute. Okay I've uhm I've denied the Motion to Terminate. So it says if the Order makes, made, if the Order made terminates, the examination shall be resumed thereafter only upon an Order of a Judge in the Court in which the action's pending. It doesn't talk about what happens if the Order's denied and it's not denied at the time of the, taking of the deposition and that's where we are, because the deposition's been terminated by virtue of you and your client leaving. And so I think I probably need to Order that the deposition resume on a date and time to be agreed upon by the parties. And I hope

that you all be able to do that but please include that in my Order because this deposition obviously needs to be completed.

OSWALT: I would --

]

COURT: Each party is to bear his or her own expense and, when it's resumed.

OSWALT: Judge, I'll be asking that that resume next week so, preferably Thursday. I don't have any Superior Court, I don't-

COURT: Well if we can get a date and time that would be great if you all can do that right now so there's no question about it later. Ms. Reed?

OSWALT: I would prefer to do it next Thursday. I don't have any Superior Court and I don't have any Domestic Court.

COURT: Does that work for you, Ms. Reed?

REED: I do not believe that it does, Your Honor. I don't have my calendar with me. Uhm, Your Honor, I would ask that this be conducted after the, because again we still will have the ED issue that we still have to do.

OSWALT: I'm not quite following Ms. Reed. Judge, as far as deposition I'm deposing her client, she hasn't requested a deposition of mine.

REED: I mean I did but I didn't do the uhm I didn't do the notice of deposition.

COURT: Well why is Thursday not good for you?

REED: I'll have to check with, let me check with my office and find out what we have.

COURT: Put in the Order that the Court orders that the deposition resume on and leave a blank for me to fill in for the date at and leave a blank for me to fill in for the time and Ms. Reed and Mr. Oswalt I expect you all to be in here in the morning with dates and times to propose so that we can set those.

OSWALT: Yes, Your Honor.

COURT: Okay, thank you.

REED: I know my client is out of state right now.

COURT: I'll bet you can contact him.

REED: Yes, Your Honor, I can.

COURT: Okay because he's probably eager to know what's happened today. Because I don't want you all to be in this situation again and some other Judge to have to deal with it. Okay you all have a good evening.

OSWALT: You too, Your Honor.

COURT: I'll see you tomorrow.

REED: When will your client be available for

deposition?

OSWALT: Preferably when there's no school, that she's missed a number of days at school.

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF ONSLOW

-'

personally.

I, Janet M. Williams, a transcriptionist and notary public in and for Onslow County, North Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing 78 pages are an accurate transcript of the proceedings taken in the before-mentioned case, the same having been heard before the Honorable Joyce A. Hamilton, Judge

Presiding, commencing on April 30, 2009, the same having been

recorded during the proceedings and transcribed by me

I further certify that I am not financially interested in the outcome of this action, a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, or am I a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel.

This 8th day of September, 2009.

JANET M. WILLIAMS
NOTARY PUBLIC
ONSLOW COUNTY
NORTH CAROLINA

Janet M. Williams

Med/Legal Services

854 Cypress Creek Road

Richlands, NC 28574

(910) 324-3868